

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 will be pending upon entry of the present amendment. Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 21, 25, 29, and 30 are amended, and claims 31-33 are newly submitted herewith. No new matter has been added to the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejections, and for the comments provided in the recent Office Action, as discussed below.

Claims 1-5, 9-15, 17, 18, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woehrl et al. (U.S. 5,173,614, hereafter *Woehrl*); claims 6-8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woehrl, in view of Oguchi (U.S. Pub. 2002/0033047); and claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woehrl, in view of Ishiyama (U.S. Patent 6,738,214).

In rejecting the claims over the newly cited Woehrl reference, the Examiner indicated that “the pending claims only recite generating a logic value. Woehrl meets this limitation, although the Woehrl logic value (L3) is passed through additional gates and is not the final output of the device. There is no positive recitation in the claims that the logic value s a triggering or activation signal that has any use after it is generated.”

Claim 1 has been amended to delete language that recites, for example, “supplying a selected logic value,” and now recites “supplying a first recognition signal.” Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 7, line 16 to page 8, line 28. In particular at page 8, lines 14-28, the operation of a device according to one embodiment is described, in which a logic value of a recognition signal is determined. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that, as used in the specification and claims, a “first recognition signal” is a signal that operates to trigger some action in another device. The signal produced at Woehrl’s line L3 cannot directly operate in such a manner because it is only one of a number of signals from more than a dozen lines, including those from lines L1, L2, L4, L5, and L6, that are subject to the operation of additional logic elements and signals before Woehrl’s, trigger signal TS is produced, that is coupled to activate airbags deployment. The Examiner does not point to any other prior art reference as teaching or suggesting this limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Identical language in claims 10, 13, 21, 25, 29, and 30 has been amended identically. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for the same reasons. These amendments do not otherwise change the respective scopes of the claims.

Claim 9 has been amended recite “an output terminal of the device for reactivation for standby,” and to replace “selected logic value” with “reactivation signal,” and now recites, in part, “a device for reactivation from stand-by, ... that includes: an output terminal of the device for reactivation for standby; ... [and] first comparison means ... supplying a reactivation signal at the output terminal” Woehrl fails to anticipate these limitations. In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner states that “the output of the multidirectional inertial device is interpreted as the output of the OR gate 44. It is noted that claim 9 does not require supplying the logic value to the output of the electronic apparatus or the device for reactivation.” The claim now clearly recites that the output terminal is that of the device for reactivation from stand-by. Thus, where the claim recites first comparison means supplying a reactivation signal at the output terminal, this clearly refers to the previously recited output terminal of the device for reactivation for standby. Woehrl fails to anticipate this limitation, which is also not found in any other art of record. For the reasons outlined above, claim 9 is allowable over the art of record.

Claim 9 has also been amended to indent the elements listed under the “device for reactivation from stand-by.”

New claims 31-33 are fully supported in the specification. Support for claim 31 can be found, for example, at page 7, lines 16-22. Support for claims 32 and 33 can be found, for example, at page 10, lines 8-16.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable, and therefore request that the Examiner reconsider this application and timely allow all pending claims. Examiner Amrany is encouraged to contact Mr. Bennett by telephone at (206) 694-4848 to discuss the above and any other distinctions between the claims and the applied references, and to address any informalities that may remain unresolved.

Application No. 10/788,962
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2008

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Harold H. Bennett II/
Harold H. Bennett II
Registration No. 52,404

HHB:lcs

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1185649_1.DOC